

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action, Applicant proposes amending claims 1, 6, 7, 20, 24, 29, 34, 35, 38, 39, and 42 to more appropriately define the invention. Applicant has canceled claim 19, without disclaimer or prejudice of the subject matter thereof. The amendment is fully supported by the specification and drawings, see, for example, page 13, lines 2-6, and page 14, lines 22-27 of the specification, and Figs. 3A-3C. Therefore, no new matter has been added. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-10, 12-18, and 20-42 remain pending, with claims 13-18 and 21-23 withdrawn from consideration.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 12, 19, 20, and 24-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; rejected claims 1-10, 12, 19, 20, and 24-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; and rejected claims 1-10, 12, 19, 20, and 24-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Puskas (U. S. Patent No. 6,313,565).

Applicant has proposed amendments to claims 1, 6, 7, 20, 24, 29, 34, 35, 38, 39, and 42. Applicant believes the proposed amendments will overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and second paragraph. The rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is rendered moot in view of its cancellation. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of 1-10, 12, 20, and 24-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Puskas.

In order to properly anticipate Applicants' claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every element of the claim in issue must be found, "either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki*

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).” See M.P.E.P. § 2131, 8th ed., 2001.

The present invention is in general related to a washing method of semiconductors, liquid-crystal displays, or electronic devices, using an ultrasonic oscillation power supply. Particularly, claim 1 recites, “[a]n ultrasonic washing method of washing a thing to be washed by supplying ultrasonic-wave-applied cleaning fluid to the thing, said ultrasonic washing method comprising applying an ultrasonic wave to a cleaning fluid in such a manner that said ultrasonic wave is turned on and off periodically, wherein a turn-off period is necessary to decrease a vibration of the thing caused by applying said ultrasonic wave to the thing.” Applicant submits that Puskas fails to teach each and every element of claim 1.

Referring to Puskas, “[q]uiet times 81 are inserted into the continuously changing frequency signal produced by the generator within a frequency range to break up the signal into smaller bursts of sound 85.” Col. 13, lines 13-16. Applicant notes that, as clearly shown in Puskas’ Fig. 6, quiet times 81 are inserted into the continuously changing frequency signal **RANDOMLY**, rather than “periodically,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Puskas at least fails to teach “said ultrasonic washing method comprising applying an ultrasonic wave to a cleaning fluid in such a manner that said ultrasonic wave is turned on and off periodically,” as recited in claim 1.

In addition, claims 24 and 29 each recites, among other things, “applying an ultrasonic wave to a cleaning fluid in such a manner that said ultrasonic wave is turned on and off periodically.” For the same reasons as set forth above, Puskas fails to teach at least these features of claims 24 and 29.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Therefore, claims 1, 24, and 29 are patentable over Puskas because Puskas does not teach each and every element of these claims. Claims 2-5, 25-28, and 30-33, which depend from claims 1, 24, and 29, respectively, are also patentable over Puskas at least because of their dependencies from an allowable base claim.

Regarding the rejection of claims 6, 34, and 38, Applicant submits that each of these claims as Applicant proposes to amend them recites “a frequency of said first ultrasonic wave and a frequency of said second ultrasonic wave are chosen to decrease a vibration”. In contrast, Puskas actually requires that “the sound intensity of these closely related frequencies builds up to a higher value” “by stringing together different frequencies from the same frequency range.” (Col. 3, lines 58-61.) Therefore, Applicant submits that Puskas fails to teach each and every element of claims 6, 34, 38, and that these claims are patentable over Puskas. Claims 7-10, 12, 20, 35-37, and 39-41, which depend from claims 6, 34, 38, respectively, are also patentable over Puskas at least because of their dependencies from an allowable base claim.

Finally, claim 42, as Applicant proposes to amend it, recites, among other things, “that said ultrasonic wave is turned on and off repeatedly by a carrier wave, . . . wherein a duty ratio of the carrier wave is 80% or less.” Puskas only teaches “the addition of quiet times 81 into a typical AM pattern 80” (col. 13, lines 9-10), and does not teach an “ultrasonic wave [being] turned on and off repeated by a carrier wave” and, therefore, also does not teach “a duty ratio of the carrier wave is 80% or less.” Thus, claim 42 is patentable over Puskas.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment after Final be entered by the Examiner, placing pending claims 1-42 in condition for allowance. This Amendment after Final should allow for immediate and favorable action by the Examiner. Also, Applicants submit that the entry of this Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner continue to dispute the patentability of the pending claims. Applicants, therefore, request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.


Should the Examiner continue to dispute the patentability of the claims after consideration of this Amendment, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representatives by telephone to discuss any remaining issues.

Please grant any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 required in entering this response. If there are any fees due under 37. C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17, which are not enclosed, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136, please charge such fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 29, 2003

By  Reg 24,014
for Richard V. Burgujian
Reg. No. 31,744

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com